H

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/833,500 | 04/11/2001 | Vincent J. Hardy | SUN1P706 | 2982 |

22434        7590        07/02/2004

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA  94704-0778

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BLACKWELL, JAMES H |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

| | **Application No.** | **Applicant(s)** |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/833,500 | HARDY, VINCENT J. |
| | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** | |
| | James H Blackwell | 2176 | |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 April 2001</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 April 2001</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Weiss et al. (hereinafter Weiss, U.S. Patent No. 6,738,951).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 5, and 10),

Weiss teaches that a Transcoder proxy (32) receives electronic documents (e.g.,

document 12) from Internet server (16) in digital format. Well known digital formats

include text-based markup language formats such as hypertext markup language

(HTML) and extensible markup language (XML). Other common digital formats include

POSTSCRIPT, portable document format (PDF), and advanced function printing (AFP).

As illustrated in Fig. 1, transcoder proxy (32) includes a rule set (34). Rule set (34)

includes rules for translating document (12) from any one of several digital document

formats (e.g., HTML, XML, POSTSCRIPT, PDF, etc.) to any one of various Braille

formats (e.g., English Braille, European Braille, Japanese Braille, and/or a grade such

as grade 1 or grade 2) (Col. 4, lines 54-66). Weiss also teaches that electronic

document (12) includes one or more elements representing document structures.

Examples of document elements include paragraphs, hypertext links, lists, tables, and

images. Transcoder proxy (32) uses the Braille format information and/or the Braille

display information (i.e., the cell count and/or the pin count), provided by client machine (22) during system initialization and/or during system use, to select rules within rule set (34) in order to translate document (12) from one digital format (e.g., HTML, XML, POSTSCRIPT, PDF, etc.) to a script written in a scripting language understood by user agent (28) within client machine (22). The script includes a description of the elements of document (12). Transcoder proxy (32) provides the produced script to user agent (28) (Col. 5 lines 18-33; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 5, and 10), *"... parsing the rendering sequence into a set of associated sub-rendering sequences wherein each of the set of sub-rendering sequences includes a basic rendering component; selecting one of the set of associated sub-rendering sequences; selecting a basic rendering component that is relevant to the user; breaking the selected one into a corresponding plurality of basic rendering components based upon the selected relevant rendering component; converting each of the corresponding plurality of basic rendering components to form a set of converted rendering components"*). Weiss does not teach *accessing the set of converted rendering components; tagging selected ones of the set of converted rendering components based upon a user supplied tagging instruction to form a subset of tagged converted rendering components; and combining the set of converted rendering components and the subset of tagged converted rendering components to form the document*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have "tagged" all or part of the document in some way as this would have been a good way to both document and make changes to the original

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

components, and in the case of Braille make corrections providing the benefit of a

syntactically correct Braille rendering of the "tagged" text.

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly dependent Claim 6), Weiss

teaches that the client machine (22) may provide Braille format information identifying

the selected Braille format to transcoder proxy (32), and transcoder proxy (32) may use

the Braille format information in order to accomplish step (44) (Col. 6, lines 26-32;

compare with Claim 2 (and similarly Claim 6), *"... the parsing is based upon a user

supplied parsing instruction"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly dependent Claim 7), Well known

digital formats include text-based markup language formats such as hypertext markup

language (HTML) and extensible markup language (XML). Other common digital

formats include POSTSCRIPT, portable document format (PDF), and advanced function

printing (AFP) (Col. 4, lines 55-60; compare with Claim 3 (and similarly Claim 7), *"...

rendering sequence is a plurality of API calls"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly dependent Claim 8), Document

(12) includes "presentation information" including text and/or user controls such as

buttons (Col. 4, lines 66-67; Col. 5, line 1; compare with Claim 4 (and similarly Claim

8), *"... the basic rendering component is selected from a group comprising: a

button, an icon, a label, a circle"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Weiss teaches that the client machine (22) may

provide Braille format information identifying the selected Braille format to transcoder

proxy (32), and transcoder proxy (32) may use the Braille format information in order to

accomplish step (44) (Col. 6, lines 26-32; compare with Claim 9, *"... the means for parsing is further based upon a user supplied rendering instruction"). and wherein each of the subset of tagged structural elements are rendered based upon a corresponding tagging instruction"*).

## *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940.  The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792.  The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.  Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.  Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.  For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
06/22/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER